HYBRIDS IN RUBUS SUBGENUS EUBATUS IN NEW ENGLAND^{1, 2}

FREDERIC L. STEELE AND A. R. HODGDON

The background for this current study will be found in the three papers we have published on New England blackberries during the past nine years, beginning in 1962^{3, 4, 5}. Aside from the cited paper on hybrids of *Rubus hispidus* and *R. setosus*, we have thus far made no attempt to characterize hybrids in the group. In our survey of New England blackberries in 1966 we thought it would have unduly complicated our study to have done so. However, at that time we were fully aware of the significance of hybridization as we indicated in the long list of rejected binomials on pp. 510-512 where, in each instance when we suspected that a name had been given to a hybrid, we also stated what we supposed the parentage to be.

The present paper then is an attempt to round out our studies on *Rubus* in New England. We have accumulated a great deal of data in the course of field and laboratory work, much of it serving to support our contention and that of some others before us that it is chiefly the high incidence of interspecific hybridization that makes classification so difficult in blackberries. Therefore, our study of New

¹Published with the approval of the Director of the New Hampshire Agricultural Experiment Station as Scientific Contribution No. 523.

This research has been supported by the New Hampshire Agricultural Experiment Station and by grants from the Central University Research Fund of the Graduate School of the University of New Hampshire and from the Northern New England Academy of Science.

³Hodgdon, A. R. & F. L. Steele. 1962. Glandularity in Rubus allegheniensis Porter. Rhodora 64: 161-168.

⁴Steele, F. L. & A. R. Hodgdon. 1963. Hybridization of Rubus hispidus and R. setosus. Rhodora 65: 262-270.

⁵Hodgdon, A. R. & F. L. Steele. 1966. Rubus subgenus Eubatus in New England. Rhodora 68: 474-513.